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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers

Thank you for your positive response and for giving us the opportunity to submit for second time our revised manuscript OHEA-D-18-00635 “Treatment decisions regarding caries and dental developmental defects in children and adolescents - a questionnaire-based study among Norwegian dentists.” The authors are very grateful for all the valuable comments and recommendations given, and we have amended the manuscript accordingly.

Editor Comments:

Please add the following reference where MIH is mentioned in the text.

Reviewer 1

Dear authors, thanks for your review. I would like to point out a few issues to be addressed.

Methods:

I still think this is important to add the context in which ZOE was given as a choice. You mentioned: "However, it is worthy to mention that ZOE based materials are frequently used for stepwise excavation and to postpone the final restoration, and is a frequent choice, especially in primary teeth. Therefore the alternative was given to the responders." Please include this in the manuscript.

-This is now included in the manuscript, page 11, lines 217-219.-

For case 2- Even if not included in the questionnaire to respondents (who might not be aware of this grading system), MIH-TI gives an idea about the severity of the case provided for readers (mostly pediatric dentists), I strongly suggest to indicate the grading of the molar in the methods section, but leave final decision to editor.

-We have now added a similar paper suggested by the editor (Ghanim A, Elfrink M, Weerheijm K, Marino R, Manton D. A Practical Method for Use in Epidemiological Studies on Enamel Hypomineralisation. European Archives of Pediatric Dentistry. 2015;16(3):235-46.-

Table 2- Why is esthetics given as a reason for extraction (case 1a), and ZOE (case 1b)?? Your answer "It is difficult to assume reason why esthetics was chosen by dentists for the extraction and ZOE. However, it should be kept in mind that only 3 dentist chose esthetics when considering extraction. And only 3 dentists chose number of affected molars/materials available/aesthetics for ZOE." Could you please mention this somewhere in discussion since it does raise questions why this has been chosen. (I think it shouldn't have been given as an option in the questionnaire).

-This is now included in the manuscript, page 12, lines 239-242.-
Reviewer 2

Thank you for the improved version of the manuscript. I think all the comments are answered and the right changes in the text are made. For me, the article can be published.